



RECEIVED
SEP 27 2001
TECH CENTER 1600/2900
CASE SU 152
162

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

HASSAN Y. ELNAGAR, ET AL.

APPLN. NO.: 09/484,844

FILED: JANUARY 18, 2000

PROCESS FOR PRODUCING
N-HALOGENATED ORGANIC COMPOUNDS

)
)
) GROUP ART UNIT: 1626
)
)
) EXAMINER: F. D. HIGEL
)
)

#7998
9-30-01

Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D. C. 20231
Sir:

In response to the Office Action of June 20, 2001, Applicants request reconsideration in light of the following comments.

REMARKS

Claims 1-131 are in the case.

The rejection of Claims 1-131 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, is deemed erroneous. It is submitted that the terms or expressions "and/or", "oxidizing" and "is oxidized" taken in the context of the claims are entirely clear and definite, and that there is no basis to support the rejection.

In the first place, the Action in suggesting that the claims are indefinite "by placing no definite limits or boundaries on the claims", is deemed erroneous as a matter of law. There is no requirement anywhere in the law of this country requiring the claims to have "definite limits or boundaries". As the Board in *Ex parte Wu* 10 USPQ 2d 2031 2033 (Bd App 1989), citing *In re Moore*, 439 F.2d 1232, 169 USPQ 236 (CCPA 1971), states: